

think, be out of place." Over against such an expression as this I am willing to place my critic's words, "Mr. McCook is inclined, however, to set too high a value on these drawings."

5. Finally, I think I may say under all the circumstances that I am excusable for believing that my so called "discovery" of Abbot's drawings was a genuine novelty. I cannot remember a single allusion in any araneological literature to the existence in the British Museum or elsewhere of those drawings. The last reference made to them of which I have knowledge was Dr. L. M. Underwood's paper on the "Progress of Arachnology in America," in the *American Naturalist* of November 1887. The author alludes to Abbot's manuscripts (miscalling him "Thomas," by the way, instead of "John"), and adds, "Knowledge of the date of preparation of this series of drawings, as well as its present place and condition is wanting. But it was in London as early as 1802, and was purchased by Baron Walekenaer in 1821." Mr. Emerton, in his several admirable monographs, makes no reference to the fact that he knew of the existence of the drawings, and does not make the slightest attempt to compare the list in his possession with the descriptions of Walckenaer. This seems to me all the more remarkable in view of the fact, as above shown, that he had accurately determined some of Hentz's species as identical with some of Abbot's numbers, and could readily have made the further step of determining their correspondence with Walckenaer's descriptions. His reasons for this reserve are doubtless satisfactory to himself, and I will not venture to criticize them; but will say that I am quite satisfied with having taken the opposite course and given to the world, at the earliest available opportunity, the information which had accidentally been placed in my possession, and which I believed at the time to be new and valuable. That it was new to most students of spiders has been made very certain by the responses to my paper. That it is valuable may in some minds admit of doubt; but, on the whole, I think that I have shown here, if not before, that the measure of doubt is very small.

*Food of Barnacles.*—PROF LEIDY stated that last summer, in June, while walking on shore at Beach Haven, N. J., he picked up a bunch of Goose-barnacles, *Lepas fascicularis*, attached to a fragment of a grass stem, *Spartina*. Finding at the time nothing else of interest, he examined the specimens, not having previously dissected a Barnacle since 1848, when he observed the eyes in *Balanus rugosus* (See Proc. 1848, 9).

All the specimens of *Lepas*, of which there were nine, had the body distended with a brownish-yellow Cyclops, in large number, fresh in appearance and generally entire. Under the circumstances he at first suspected that they might be a larval form of the *Lepas*, though aware of the fact that the cirripeds proceed from a Nauplius embryo, which passes through a Cypris stage before assuming the Barnacle condition. On further investigation he was convinced

that the Cyclops were food and filled the stomach. It appeared remarkable that they should have been so well preserved and not crushed by the strongly, six-toothed mandibles of the Barnacle. Some additional specimens of this species and a few of *Lepas anatifera*, subsequently examined did not contain such an accumulation of similar food; but usually the contents of the stomach consisted from two to half a dozen small gastropods with the shell, several species of entomostraca, some sand grains and a few vegetable fibres. In all, the brood-capsule, a thin elliptical lamina, situated between the body and the shell, contained Nauplius larvae.

---

DECEMBER 18.

Mr. CHARLES MORRIS in the chair.

Sixteen persons present.

---

DECEMBER 25.

The President, Dr. JOSEPH LEIDY, in the chair.

A paper entitled "Notes on Geology and Mineralogy" by John Eyerman was presented for publication.

The death of Dr. Casper Wister, a member, Dec. 20, was announced.